

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 260

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#11
Rose
5-3-94

In re application of: Levine

Serial No.: 08/005,704

Group No.: 2602

Filed: January 19, 1993

Examiner: Flynn

For: TV VIEWING AND RECORDING SYSTEM

REPLY

Box AF
Hon. Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In accordance with a request from Examiner Flynn made during a telephone conversation on April 13, 1994, the Applicant wishes to clarify that the use of the term "baseband video signal" is meant only to relate to a video signal which has not been modulated onto a RF carrier. In a previous telephone conversation with the Examiner, the Applicant was told that the objection raised in the Advisory Action mailed March 22, 1994 objecting to the term "baseband" would be withdrawn, since the Examiner had come to the conclusion that although this term had not specifically been recited in the specification, the term is synonymous with an unmodulated video signal, which is clearly set forth in the specification and drawings.

LAW OFFICES KRASS & YOUNG, P.C., 3001 W. BIG BEAVER ROAD, SUITE 624, TROY, MICHIGAN 48064-3109 (313) 849-3333



Any questions should be directed to the undersigned at
(313) 662-0270.

Respectfully submitted,


By: 

John G. Posa
Reg. No. 37,424

Dated: 18 April 94

I hereby certify that this paper is being
deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on
the date shown below with sufficient postage
as first class mail in an envelope addressed
to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,
Washington, D.C. 20231.

Date: 4/20/94


Sheryl L. Hammer

